

City of Minneapolis
CPED - Public Land Sale and Acquisition Form

Section I. Property Information

PROJECT COORDINATORS COMPLETE SECTION I.

ENTIRE FORM MUST BE COMPLETED PRIOR TO MARKETING PROPERTY

PLEASE ATTACH MAP OF SUBJECT PROPERTY AND ALL ADJACENT PARCELS

Submitted by: Edith Johnson

Phone #: 673-5262

Form Initiated Date: 3/24/2010

Complete by Date:

1. Address: 416 30th Avenue North

2. Property Identification Number (PIN): 10-029-24-32-0070

3. Lot Size: 4,538 SF

4. Current Use: Vacant land

5. Current Zoning: R2B

6. Proposed future use (include attachments as necessary): Vacant parcel to be developed as single family ownership housing development.

7. List addresses of adjacent parcels owned by CPED/City: 430 30th Avenue North.

8. Project Coordinator comments:

PROJECT COORDINATOR: EMAIL FORM TO JOSEPH.BERNARD@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US

Section II. Zoning Review

9. Lot is Buildable for **any** structure ☒ Non-Buildable for **any** structure ☐

Explain: Single-family dwellings are a permitted use in the R2B zoning district. The minimum lot area for a SFD in the R2B district is 5,000 square feet; this parcel is nonconforming as to lot area, but a single family home may be built per the lot of record exception in 531.100.

10. Will any land use applications be required to achieve the **proposed** future use noted in item 6?

Yes ☒ No ☐ If yes, what applications? At minimum, administrative site plan review will be required.

11. Comments:

Completed by: Aly Pennucci Date: 3/24/2010

ZONING STAFF: EMAIL FORM TO JOSEPH.BERNARD@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US

Section III. Community Planning Review

12. List adopted small area plan(s) in effect for parcel: None

13. Future land use/designation(s) identified in The Minneapolis Plan and other adopted plans: Property is designated "urban neighborhood." Not in a designated land use feature.

14. Is future land use proposed in item 6 consistent with future land use plans?

Yes ☒ No ☐ If no, why not?

15. Does the City own adjacent parcels that could be combined with this parcel to create a larger development?

Yes ☐ No ☒ If yes, explain possible development scenarios

16. Is parcel identified in adopted plans as a catalyst/essential site for future development?

Yes ☐ No ☒ If Yes, what type of development?

Comments:

Completed by: Tom Leighton Date: 3/24/2010

COMMUNITY PLANNER: EMAIL FORM TO JOSEPH.BERNARD@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US

City of Minneapolis
CPED - Public Land Sale and Acquisition Form

Planning Director Review

by: Barbara Sporlein Date: 3/25/2010

PLANNING DIRECTOR:

EMAIL FORM TO JOSEPH.BERNARD@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US

Multi-Family Housing Staff Comments

by: Wes Butler Date: 3/24/2010

Comments: Project is not needed for any Multifamily project.

Single-Family Housing Staff Comments

by: Elfric Porte, II

Date: 3/24/2010

Comments: I support the disposition strategy as proposed.

Real Estate Development Services Staff Comments

by: Darrell Washington Date: 3/24/2010

Comments: Proposed development appears consistent with CPED real estate procedures.

Business Development Staff Comments

by: Kristin Guild

Date: 3/24/2010

Comments: The property is not needed for economic development purposes.

Economic Development Director Review

by: Cathy Polasky

Date: 3/24/2010

PLEASE CHECK ONE BOX:

☒ **PROCEED** to market the property as proposed

Project Coordinator: Contact Community Planner (in Section III) in advance of CD Committee hearing to acquire City Planning Commission finding of consistency with *The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth*

☐ **HOLD** this property for discussion at next available Director's Meeting

Note: If there is policy conflict or strategic options outlined in this form, this land sale must be discussed at a Director's Meeting so that a decision on whether or not to proceed can be made

Director's Notes (reason for **HOLD** status): _____

Housing Director Review

by: Tom Streitz Date: 3/24/2010

EMAIL COMPLETED FORM TO JOSEPH.BERNARD@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US

Note: The completed and signed CPED public land form and the Planning Commission action as to the consistency with the City's Comprehensive Plan **must** be attached to the staff report that is submitted to the Community Development Committee.

City of Minneapolis
CPED - Public Land Sale and Acquisition Form

Section I. Property Information

PROJECT COORDINATORS COMPLETE SECTION I.

ENTIRE FORM MUST BE COMPLETED PRIOR TO MARKETING PROPERTY

PLEASE ATTACH MAP OF SUBJECT PROPERTY AND ALL ADJACENT PARCELS

Submitted by: Edie Oates

Phone #: 673-5229

Form Initiated Date: 3/10/2010

Complete by Date:

1. Address: 419 30th Avenue N

2. Property Identification Number (PIN): 10-029-24-32-0153

3. Lot Size: 4,756 SF

4. Current Use: Vacant SF Home

5. Current Zoning: R2B

6. Proposed future use (include attachments as necessary): The SF home will be rehabilitated by Habitat and sold to an owner-occupant.

7. List addresses of adjacent parcels owned by CPED/City:

8. Project Coordinator comments:

PROJECT COORDINATOR: EMAIL FORM TO JOSEPH.BERNARD@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US

Section II. Zoning Review

9. Lot is Buildable for **any** structure ☒ Non-Buildable for **any** structure ☐

Explain: Single-family dwellings are a permitted use in the R2B zoning district. The minimum lot area for a SFD in the R2B district is 5,000 square feet. This parcel is nonconforming as to lot area, but a single family home may be built per the lot of record exception in 531.100

10. Will any land use applications be required to achieve the **proposed** future use noted in item 6?

Yes ☐ No ☒ If yes, what applications?

11. Comments:

Completed by: Aly Pennucci Date: 3/11/2010

ZONING STAFF: EMAIL FORM TO JOSEPH.BERNARD@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US

Section III. Community Planning Review

12. List adopted small area plan(s) in effect for parcel: None

13. Future land use/designation(s) identified in The Minneapolis Plan and other adopted plans: Not in a designated area. Property classified "Urban Neighborhood"

14. Is future land use proposed in item 6 consistent with future land use plans?

Yes ☒ No ☐ If no, why not?

15. Does the City own adjacent parcels that could be combined with this parcel to create a larger development?

Yes ☐ No ☒ If yes, explain possible development scenarios

16. Is parcel identified in adopted plans as a catalyst/essential site for future development?

Yes ☐ No ☒ If Yes, what type of development?

Comments:

Completed by: Tom Leighton Date: 3/11/2010

COMMUNITY PLANNER: EMAIL FORM TO JOSEPH.BERNARD@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US

City of Minneapolis
CPED - Public Land Sale and Acquisition Form

Planning Director Review

by: Barbara Sporlein Date: 3/11/2010

PLANNING DIRECTOR:

EMAIL FORM TO JOSEPH.BERNARD@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US

Multi-Family Housing Staff Comments

by: Wes Butler Date: 3/12/2010

Comments: Too small for MF development.

Single-Family Housing Staff Comments

by: Elfric Porte Date: 3/15/2010

Comments: SF concurs.

Real Estate Development Services Staff Comments

by: Darrell Washington Date: 3/15/2010

Comments: Proposed development appears feasible and consistent with real estate policies.

Business Development Staff Comments

by: Kristen Guild

Date: 3/15/2010

Comments: Business Development does not have an interest in this property for economic development purposes.

Economic Development Director Review

by: Cathy Polasky

Date: 3/15/2010

PLEASE CHECK ONE BOX:

☒ **PROCEED** to market the property as proposed

Project Coordinator: Contact Community Planner (in Section III) in advance of CD Committee hearing to acquire City Planning Commission finding of consistency with *The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth*

☐ **HOLD** this property for discussion at next available Director's Meeting

Note: If there is policy conflict or strategic options outlined in this form, this land sale must be discussed at a Director's Meeting so that a decision on whether or not to proceed can be made

Director's Notes (reason for **HOLD** status): _____

Housing Director Review

by: Tom Streitz Date: 3/18/2010

EMAIL COMPLETED FORM TO JOSEPH.BERNARD@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US

Note: The completed and signed CPED public land form and the Planning Commission action as to the consistency with the City's Comprehensive Plan **must** be attached to the staff report that is submitted to the Community Development Committee.

City of Minneapolis
CPED - Public Land Sale and Acquisition Form

Section I. Property Information

PROJECT COORDINATORS COMPLETE SECTION I.

ENTIRE FORM MUST BE COMPLETED PRIOR TO MARKETING PROPERTY

PLEASE ATTACH MAP OF SUBJECT PROPERTY AND ALL ADJACENT PARCELS

Submitted by: Edith Johnson

Phone #: 673-5262

Form Initiated Date: 3/24/2010

Complete by Date:

1. Address: 430 30th Avenue N

2. Property Identification Number (PIN): 10-029-24-32-0072

3. Lot Size: 5,335 SF

4. Current Use: Vacant Land

5. Current Zoning: R2B

6. Proposed future use (include attachments as necessary): Vacant parcel to be developed as single family ownership housing development.

7. List addresses of adjacent parcels owned by CPED/City: 416 30th Avenue North

8. Project Coordinator comments:

PROJECT COORDINATOR: EMAIL FORM TO JOSEPH.BERNARD@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US

Section II. Zoning Review

9. Lot is Buildable for **any** structure ☒ Non-Buildable for **any** structure ☐

Explain: Single-family dwellings are a permitted use in the R2B district with a minimum lot area of 5,000 square feet and a minimum lot width of 40 feet

10. Will any land use applications be required to achieve the **proposed** future use noted in item 6?

Yes ☒ No ☐ If yes, what applications? At minimum, administrative site plan review will be required.

11. Comments:

Completed by: Aly Pennucci Date: 3/24/2010

ZONING STAFF: EMAIL FORM TO JOSEPH.BERNARD@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US

Section III. Community Planning Review

12. List adopted small area plan(s) in effect for parcel: None

13. Future land use/designation(s) identified in The Minneapolis Plan and other adopted plans: Property is designated "urban neighborhood." Not in a designated land use feature.

14. Is future land use proposed in item 6 consistent with future land use plans?

Yes ☒ No ☐ If no, why not?

15. Does the City own adjacent parcels that could be combined with this parcel to create a larger development?

Yes ☐ No ☒ If yes, explain possible development scenarios

16. Is parcel identified in adopted plans as a catalyst/essential site for future development?

Yes ☐ No ☒ If Yes, what type of development?

Comments:

Completed by: Tom Leighton Date: 3/24/2010

COMMUNITY PLANNER: EMAIL FORM TO JOSEPH.BERNARD@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US

City of Minneapolis
CPED - Public Land Sale and Acquisition Form

Planning Director Review

by: Barbara Sporlein Date: 3/25/2010

PLANNING DIRECTOR:

EMAIL FORM TO JOSEPH.BERNARD@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US

Multi-Family Housing Staff Comments

by: Wes Butler Date: 3/24/2010

Comments: Project is not needed for any Multifamily project.

Single-Family Housing Staff Comments

by: Elfric Porte, II

Date: 3/24/2010

Comments: I support the disposition strategy as proposed.

Real Estate Development Services Staff Comments

by: Darrell Washington Date: 3/24/2010

Comments: Proposed development appears consistent with CPED real estate procedures.

Business Development Staff Comments

by: Kristin Guild

Date: 3/24/2010

Comments: The property is not needed for economic development purposes.

Economic Development Director Review

by: Cathy Polasky

Date: 3/24/2010

PLEASE CHECK ONE BOX:

☒ **PROCEED** to market the property as proposed

Project Coordinator: Contact Community Planner (in Section III) in advance of CD Committee hearing to acquire City Planning Commission finding of consistency with *The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth*

☐ **HOLD** this property for discussion at next available Director's Meeting

Note: If there is policy conflict or strategic options outlined in this form, this land sale must be discussed at a Director's Meeting so that a decision on whether or not to proceed can be made

Director's Notes (reason for **HOLD** status): _____

Housing Director Review

by: Tom Streitz Date: 3/24/2010

EMAIL COMPLETED FORM TO JOSEPH.BERNARD@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US

Note: The completed and signed CPED public land form and the Planning Commission action as to the consistency with the City's Comprehensive Plan **must** be attached to the staff report that is submitted to the Community Development Committee.

City of Minneapolis
CPED - Public Land Sale and Acquisition Form

Section I. Property Information

PROJECT COORDINATORS COMPLETE SECTION I.

ENTIRE FORM MUST BE COMPLETED PRIOR TO MARKETING PROPERTY

PLEASE ATTACH MAP OF SUBJECT PROPERTY AND ALL ADJACENT PARCELS

Submitted by: Edie Oates

Phone #: 673-5229

Form Initiated Date: 3/4/2010

Complete by Date:

1. Address: 2917 6th Street North

2. Property Identification Number (PIN): 10-029-24-32-0114

3. Lot Size: 9,075 SF

4. Current Use: Vacant SF structure

5. Current Zoning: R2B

6. Proposed future use (include attachments as necessary): Property is part of the Eco-Village development and will be sold to Habitat for Humanity for rehabilitation and provide ownership housing to low income households under the NSP Program.

7. List addresses of adjacent parcels owned by CPED/City: None

8. Project Coordinator comments:

PROJECT COORDINATOR: EMAIL FORM TO JOSEPH.BERNARD@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US

Section II. Zoning Review

9. Lot is Buildable for **any** structure ☒ Non-Buildable for **any** structure ☐

Explain: Single-family dwellings are a permitted use in the R2B zoning district. The minimum lot area for a SFD in the R2B district is 5,000 square feet.

10. Will any land use applications be required to achieve the **proposed** future use noted in item 6?

Yes ☐ No ☒ If yes, what applications?

11. Comments:

Completed by: Aly Pennucci Date: 3/9/2010

ZONING STAFF: EMAIL FORM TO JOSEPH.BERNARD@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US

Section III. Community Planning Review

12. List adopted small area plan(s) in effect for parcel: None

13. Future land use/designation(s) identified in The Minneapolis Plan and other adopted plans: Not in a designated area. Property classified "Urban Neighborhood"

14. Is future land use proposed in item 6 consistent with future land use plans?

Yes ☒ No ☐ If no, why not?

15. Does the City own adjacent parcels that could be combined with this parcel to create a larger development?

Yes ☐ No ☒ If yes, explain possible development scenarios

16. Is parcel identified in adopted plans as a catalyst/essential site for future development?

Yes ☐ No ☒ If Yes, what type of development?

Comments:

Completed by: Tom Leighton Date: 3/11/2010

COMMUNITY PLANNER: EMAIL FORM TO JOSEPH.BERNARD@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US

City of Minneapolis
CPED - Public Land Sale and Acquisition Form

Planning Director Review

by: Barbara Sporlein Date: 3/11/2010

PLANNING DIRECTOR:

EMAIL FORM TO JOSEPH.BERNARD@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US

Multi-Family Housing Staff Comments

by: Wes Butler Date: 3/15/2010

Comments: Too small for MF development.

Single-Family Housing Staff Comments

by: Elfric Porte Date: 3/15/2010

Comments: SF concurs.

Real Estate Development Services Staff Comments

by: Darrell Washington Date: 3/15/2010

Comments: Proposed development appears feasible and consistent with real estate policies.

Business Development Staff Comments

by: Kristin Guild

Date: 3/12/2010

Comments: Business Development does not have an interest in this property for economic development purposes.

Economic Development Director Review

by: Cathy Polasky

Date: 3/15/2010

PLEASE CHECK ONE BOX:

☒ **PROCEED** to market the property as proposed

Project Coordinator: Contact Community Planner (in Section III) in advance of CD Committee hearing to acquire City Planning Commission finding of consistency with *The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth*

☐ **HOLD** this property for discussion at next available Director's Meeting

Note: If there is policy conflict or strategic options outlined in this form, this land sale must be discussed at a Director's Meeting so that a decision on whether or not to proceed can be made

Director's Notes (reason for **HOLD** status): _____

Housing Director Review

by: Tom Streitz Date: 3/18/2010

EMAIL COMPLETED FORM TO JOSEPH.BERNARD@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US

Note: The completed and signed CPED public land form and the Planning Commission action as to the consistency with the City's Comprehensive Plan **must** be attached to the staff report that is submitted to the Community Development Committee.